

A. F. U. BULLETIN

OFFICIAL ORGAN OF ALBERTA FARMERS' UNION

206 Agency Building, Edmonton, Alberta, Phone 25965

VOL. II.

Edmonton, Alberta, December, 1942.

NUMBER 12.

A Legend of Truth

Once on a time, the ancient legends tell,
Truth, rising from the bottom of her well,
Looked on the World, but, hearing how it lied,
Returned to her seclusion horrified.

There she abode, so conscious of her worth
Not even Pilate's Question called her forth,
Nor Galileo, kneeling to deny
The Laws that hold our Planet 'neath the sky.
Meantime her kindred sister, whom men call
Fiction, did all her work and more than all,
With so much zeal, devotion, tact and care,
That no one noticed truth was elsewhere.

Then came a War, when, bombed and gassed and mined,
Truth rose once more, perforce, to meet mankind,
And through the dust and glare and wreck of things
Beheld a phantom on unbalanced wings,
Reeling and groping, dazed dishevelled, dumb
But semaphoring direr deeds to come.

Truth hailed and bade her stand; the quavering shade,
Clung to her knees and babbled, "Sister, aid !
I am, — I was — they Deputy, and men
Resought me for my useful tongue or pen
To gloss their gentle deeds and I complied,
And they, and thy demands, were satisfied.
But this — "she pointed o'er the blistered plain,
Where men as Gods and Devils wrought amain —
"This is beyond me ! Take thy work again".



NATIONAL FARM RADIO FORUM

Monday, October 26th, 1942

Claude Wickard, Secretary, U. S. Department of Agriculture:

I am glad to have this chance to talk to the farm people of Canada. Here in the United States we are keenly interested in the way our neighbors in Canada are meeting the problems of farming in wartime. So I imagine you are interested in what United States farmers are doing. After all, farmers of both countries are working toward the same goal — producing food that will help bring victory over the Axis.

I'm sure many of you have heard of our crop production goals and of the work of our County and State Agricultural War Boards. From this it would be easy to gather that we have a brand new war programme. As a matter of fact, we have largely built on what we already had. Our farm programme is a combination of old and new agencies, old and new programmes, and old and new methods.

The best way for me to begin is to state our basic wartime policy for agriculture. We start with the premise that food produced in the United States is a part of the total war resources of the United Nations. We must produce the foods which are most needed, and arrange to distribute them most efficiently.

The United Nations must plan their food programme in such a way as to save the most shipping possible. It is wise to produce wheat and potatoes in Britain for military and civilian food needs there, rather than to depend on shipments from abroad. Similarly it is wise for Australia to feed our soldiers who are on that continent, rather than for us to ship all kinds of food thousands of miles across the Pacific. On the other hand, the United States, like Canada, is on the shortest ocean route to Great Britain and to Russia. Foods that are badly needed in England and Russia should come from Canada and the United States.

In general, we in the United States must produce food for three large groups: First, we must feed our own armed forces at points the world over, with a few exceptions like Australia; second, we must send great amounts of food to our Allies; third, we must feed our own civilian population, millions of whom are working in the nation's war factories.

This means converting to war production just as factories have converted. We have gone a long way along this road already, but we must go farther. We must concentrate our land, our labour, and our equipment on foods and fibres and oil-bearing crops which are most needed.

Most of the machinery for doing this job is already at hand. It has been developed by our acreage adjustment programmes. Undoubtedly you have heard of the Triple A—that is, our Agricultural Adjustment Agency. In the past it has largely adjusted downward, but now for most crops it is adjusting upward. These adjustments are made possible through acreage and parity payments and crop loans.

Out of the loan programme the Ever-Normal Granary was developed. From this granary, wheat and corn are coming regularly for feeding our meat animals, poultry and dairy cattle. This government-owned grain is being released at reduced prices. We are putting particular emphasis on releasing some of our huge wheat supply for use as feed.

Another part of our machinery has been the guarantee of price supports. Some of this has been provided by commodity loans; that is, loans to farmers have been made on commodities in storage. Other support has been provided by outright purchases of a commodity by the government.

Some new machinery, naturally, has been required in planning for and producing the food for the United Nations. The Combined Food Board of the United States and the United Kingdom determines the food needs of the United Nations, and decides where the food can best be produced. One of the chief considerations is saving cargo space, through seeing that food is produced as close as possible to the areas where it will be used. As you know, Canada is represented on all of the operating committees of the Combined Food Board.

To work in conjunction with this Board and handle the domestic food problems, we have set up a Foods Requirements Committee for the United States. This Committee, of which I am chairman, is responsible for production and allocation of all civilian and military food supplies. It is really the central food authority of the United States. It helps balance our needs for food production against other war needs. For instance, it keeps the War Production Board informed of farm machinery requirements, so that the steel used on the farm can be allocated in accordance with the demands for steel in more direct war production. This Committee works closely with the Department of Agriculture in developing farm programmes.

As you may know, the Department of Ag-

riculture before Pearl Harbour set up Defense Boards which were really a combination of the Department's field forces. After the war broke out, these became known as War Boards. They are located in each of the 3,022 counties of the nation, with an over-all Board in each of the forty-eight states, which reports directly to me in Washington. Through these co-ordinated Boards, all the facilities of the Department are focused on helping this country's six million farmers produce and market food and fibre needed by the United Nations.

Regulation of farm prices does not come under the War Boards. On the price problem, the Department of Agriculture and the Office of Price Administration work hand in hand. For most of this year there was no price ceiling, in the usual sense, for raw agricultural commodities. But now that farm prices have reached the average of parity, and over, ceilings are being considered.

We are not forgetting, of course, that production of essential foods is the all-important thing. Some commodities — one of them is meat — require more than parity to get full production. Most of them are above parity now. These present price levels are to be maintained unless they interfere seriously with existing wholesale and retail ceilings. If the ceiling farm prices of some products are not high enough to call out maximum production, then subsidies may be used for crops we need in great quantity. This will give the same stimulus that rising prices would, yet it avoids punching any holes in the whole price structure.

Right here is a good place to point out that our price programme in the United States calls for floors as well as ceilings. A limit is set on how low prices can fall, as well as how high they can rise. The chief purpose is to prevent a sudden collapse during the war and to keep farm families from taking the licking they did after the First World War.

You probably know that our crops this year broke all previous records. As a matter of fact, we increased them by more than one-fourth over the 1935-39 average, and this does not take into account our tremendous increase in meat and dairy products and some other commodities. We were blessed with good weather, but in the achievement of our goals, as announced and planned, most of the credit should go to the farmers themselves. They produced the crops we need most in the greatest quantities. For instance, they doubled our production of oil-bearing crops to more than replace the supply lost when the Japs shut off our shipments of vegetable oils from the Far East.

It is a good thing that our production was so great this year because future demands upon American food and fibre will be tremendous. At the same time, our production difficulties in ag-

riculture will increase. There are sharp limits on the fertilizer and new machinery we can have for farm production next year. But the shortage of manpower is the most serious difficulty we will face.

Even this year many farmers ran into trouble getting enough hired help on the farms. We know that more and more farm workers will be drawn into the military forces and that more will be required for industrial production. We know that the lack of farm labour next year will handicap us greatly in reaching our farm goals. As a matter of fact, it is uncertain whether we can reach the goals which we have in mind for some crops. If we do, it will be because the farmers work even longer and harder than they did this year, and because they concentrate all their land and effort on products that are absolutely essential. Farm women and children will have to carry a heavier part of the load, and farm neighbors will have to exchange their time and their machines over wider areas.

We know that 1943 will be a crucial year and that we must make an extreme effort to reach our food goals. We must somehow accomplish the enormous task before us. Canada and the United States together must provide much of the food necessary for the cause of the United Nations and for feeding the hungry peoples of the earth after the war is won.

* * *

Glenn J. Talbott, President, North Dakota Farmers' Union:

It is my privilege to bring greetings from the Farmers' Union of the United States. At the outset I should like to express to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and the Canadian Federation of Agriculture my deep appreciation for this opportunity to bring to the hundreds of listener groups throughout Canada our war programmes as viewed by the working farmers of the United States.

Claude Wickard, our Secretary of Agriculture to whom you have just listened, has often stated that "food and fibre will win the war and write the peace." Those United Nations which are close to the battlefronts are depending on us for food, fibre and war machines. We must meet those needs if we are to continue to live as a free people.

We working farmers in the United States realize our obligation. We want our agricultural production machines to get under way at maximum capacity immediately. Farmers in the United States know that we must make, at once, the adjustments necessary for all-out production in agriculture in our country if we are to supply the war needs of Britain, China, Russia and other members of the United Nations. We insist that

our Secretary of Agriculture be given broad war-time powers equal to his tremendous responsibility of delivering food and fibre for the United Nations' cause at the time and place and in the amounts required for victory.

In order that we can maintain our homes and operate our farms at maximum capacity for the duration, our internal economic structure must provide us with a price for our produce that will keep us financially solvent. We **must have parity** prices. We ask for no more or no less. We working farmers will not be a party to inflation in our economic structure. Any call on the part of agriculture for more than parity prices is certain to set the inflation spiral in action. Likewise, we must not permit any other economic group to receive more than a parity price for their production. Many months ago, previous to President Roosevelt's call for stabilization of industrial and farm prices and of labour's wages, we in the Farmers' Union representing the family type farmer in our Country asked for such a stabilization of prices all across the board.

It was a costly mistake to provide 110% of parity, as ceiling levels for farm commodity prices in our original price control act. As a nation, we paid dearly for it in general price increase, in resulting wages increases and, most recently, the bitter Congressional fight over the Anti-Inflation Bill that found farm leaders at odds and in the public mind pictured farmers as selfishly attempting to profiteer at the expense of the war effort. This picture was cruelly unfair to the great mass of working farmers and their families who will go to the limit of their strength, resources and ingenuity to meet the war quotas set by our Department of Agriculture.

We were recently successful in removing this hazardous provision in the original price control act. We now have legislation which allows ceilings to be placed on farm commodity prices at 100% of parity — with the provision that prices may be permitted to go to any figure beyond 100% of parity, if, in the judgement of the Price Administrator, this should be necessary to provide incentive for expanded production of deficit crops.

Price ceilings at parity are a protection to farmers and to the nation, insofar as the hazard of inflation is concerned, but they do not offer assurances of a market price now or after the war to offset the financial risks involved in all-out production.

We have insisted that both from the farmers' standpoint and in the public interest, it was equally as important to have price supporting floors which would assure farmers parity, as to have price ceilings which would assure us against inflation. This programme is now implemented on all basic crops through non-recourse loans from the Commodity Credit Corporation, the level of

which under the terms of the Price Control Act shall equal 90% of the parity price. These 90% loans plus Soil Conservation and Parity Payments will assure producers of basic crops 100% of parity. On an increasing number of non-basic commodities, the Commodity Credit Corporation is establishing loan programmes at such rates as will seemingly assure continued production. On certain other crops, such as poultry, eggs and dairy products, price support has been given producers through the direct purchase programme of the Agricultural Marketing Administration which handles, among other things, Lend-Lease purchases for the government. Continued realistic adjustments of such loan levels and bid prices for direct purchases, by these agencies, will need to be made so as to provide incentive for such shifts in production as the needs of the United Nations may require. President Roosevelt has pledged us that he will support the maintenance of these price floors for a minimum of two years following the war.

Iron and steel are vital to our combat machinery. Food is a vital need of our soldiers who operate those machines. Some place along the line in the allocation of iron and steel for our war effort must be an adequate allocation of that metal for our farms to assure a steady flow of food and fibre to the war fronts.

Farmers in the United States have been allotted 38% of the iron used in 1940 for new machinery in 1943. About one and a half times as much iron has been allotted farmers for repairs in 1943 as was used in 1940. We can continue operation on that amount in 1943. But what about 1944 and 1945? We insist that farm machines are war machines and must be treated as such in iron allocations. We will go the limit to keep them in operation, but there is a point where repairs and finally replacement becomes vital to our production effort. The situation in regard to commercial fertilizer is very similar.

Difficult as the problem of machinery and farm supplies may be, it is much less complicated than the basic problem of manpower. The problem of manpower on our farms has become more acute in the last few weeks as Selective Service deferments for the crop season now ending begin to expire. Something must be done **now** to stop the drain of manpower from farms in the United States or farm production will, despite our best efforts, fall far short of goals in 1943, '44, and '45.

The manpower problem received nationwide attention during the Congressional debate on President Roosevelt's anti-inflation programme. A few "business as usual" farm leaders sought deliberately to confuse the problem of farm manpower with the farm price issue. However, by democratic discussion in and out of Congress, and after the folks back home had been heard from it was established that prices, regardless

of their upper limits, would not insure to agriculture an adequate labour supply. Price as an incentive to production is important unless other necessary factors of production are considered. Farmers must have **labour and machinery plus a reasonable price** if they are to fulfill their responsibilities in achieving production goals.

We already have evidence of how crucial the farm labour situation is in the United States. The Farmers' Union has only recently been able to impress upon Congress and Government Administrators the seriousness of the labour shortage upon farms. Many months ago we foresaw the danger; now the actual crisis is here and must be dealt with at once.

The bulk of our agricultural production comes from farms which we term the family type farm. To continue drafting or to allow the enlistment in the service of necessary men from these family type farms is certain to curtail our productive capacity. The large commercial farmers a minority group in our country, must also be assured labour for the war effort. However, our government must require that these large employers of agricultural labour shall provide a decent and adequate standard of living for these workers and their families. The best hope for meeting our production quotas in 1943 and later years lies in the total mobilization, intelligent placement, financial and technical assistance for the millions of low-income farm families who for so many years have eked out a bare existence, and whose meagre facilities do not permit full use of their available labour power. Their enlistment in the war effort will be a practical down payment on the four freedoms for which we fight and will immeasurably strengthen our war effort.

The manpower drain from our farms has already gone so far as to cause a drastic **"potential"** curtailment in production for 1943 unless immediate attention is given the problem. The sale of many beef and dairy herds has already taken place. The continued sale of such herds will ultimately place great numbers on the slaughter markets as the culling and shifting of animals continues. Years are required to replace these herds.

This tragic trend in our agricultural industry will only stop when we deal with the problem of manpower — and do it realistically. Not only numbers of men must be considered. Their skill and experience must be taken into account. The Agricultural industry in our nation requires skilled and experienced men. The great part of our agriculture is highly mechanized and makes efficient use of labour. But in-experienced labour cannot be entrusted with costly machines — costly not only as to money value, but as to the scarcity of new machinery, machine repairs, and the time of other workers to produce replacements.

We must determine, at once, as accurately

as we possibly can, the maximum requirements of the United Nations, the minimum needs of our civilian population and the needs of our own fighting forces. With that as our goal, we must provide the irreducible minimum of manpower upon our farms and in our factories necessary in achieving those production goals, sufficiently and on time. We've had too much of "too little and too late."

What are the most pressing needs of China, Britain and Russia?

Those countries as well as other United Nations with whom we have joined to preserve freedom for mankind, are all calling upon us for war production material — armaments, munitions, and food. As time passes, whatever reserves they had accumulated, dwindle, and their need becomes constantly more acute. The farmers of the United States must fulfill their obligation to the cause of freedom.

Our continent is being looked to as the arsenal of freedom. World events and geography caused our Allies overseas to meet the military force of fascist nations first. Consequently, their first effort was directed towards the immediate mobilization and training of all their physically able manpower to actively resist the aggressor. Entire countries became battle-fronts. All these nations on the battlefronts have huge armies — trained and experienced soldiers. Training and experience will carry them only so far as their guns, boats, planes, munitions, food and clothing will permit them to be effective. Our part becomes increasingly one of supply as we realize the great quantities of war materials that will be necessary to keep their war machines in action.

We are coming to understand the unbalance existing in war machines of China, Britain, Russia, and other nations fighting with us, particularly on the war fronts. These nations have built armed forces much greater than their own economic resources can support. They dared to do so only because they had the assurance that the full productive strength of America's farms, factories and shipyards would be geared to meet their needs. Dare we fail them? Shall we blindly drain so much manpower into **our** Armed Forces as to seriously cripple our production machines and thereby lessen the output of materials so vitally needed by armies already in active combat? Our answer shall flow in an uninterrupted stream from our fields, our shipyards and the assembly lines of our great mass production factories — yes, a stream, soon a river, and finally a devastating flood which in the end will engulf the dictators and prove once again that the united and voluntary efforts of a free people will always prevail over the boasted efficiency of totalitarianism.

This war is a total war. We must gather all our resources into the effort. We must let no

part of our machine lag. As we place armies in the field, we must be confident that the supply line will flow steadily and adequate to the end.

May I summarize by saying that, if we are correct in regard to the meaning of the requests made by our Allies in this war, our job is one primarily of production — sparing all the manpower we can to make up a fighting force to aid in active combat.

We farmers must therefore be assured above all of sufficient manpower to accomplish our task. We believe our greatest contribution to our Allies in the world struggle is production of a plentiful supply of food and fibre for their peoples and

their arming. As we are the arsenal of the democracies so also shall we be the larder of the democracies. **This we must do; this we can do; this we shall do—and from here on out—neither “too little nor too late.”**

In conclusion may I say that it is our hope, as I know it is your hope, that this terrible holocaust may soon end. In our plans now for peace, and in our actions when peace does come, may we have the foresight and ability to make this a word in which **people**, wherever they may be, have economic and political freedom, a high standard of living, social equality and security in their homes.

Don't Strive Too Much For The Material Things!

We often hear this advice given and we suppose it is well meant. Also is it quite likely that the giver of advice thinks quite sincerely that it would do a lot of good especially if it was acted upon by the hearers. Of course we know that we are one of those unregenerate individuals who is always peering into the guts of things and trying to find out what makes them go. We also believe that the old saying, that actions speak louder than words, has considerable merit, and without being a confirmed cynic we are yet cynical enough when we hear such advice being handed out to say, Oh Yeah. How about trying it yourself? My own experience may have been exceptional but I don't recollect this advice ever having been handed out by a person who was genuinely poor. Now why is this? Do not poor people realize their good fortune. Are they unappreciative of their good luck? Or is it one of those things that can only be properly appreciated when we see other people enjoying it? For instance the wealthy individual who is trying to get back to nature and reduce the waist line by shooting a round of golf expresses envy of the farmer and his men who are slogging away, putting up hay in the next field when the thermometer stands at 90 degrees in the shade and when the golfer enjoys a well earned rest in the welcome shade together with a drag at comradely flask, how he envies the lot of the farmer who simply revels in the punishing heat. Or the partridge shooter after an hours tramp across the stubble on a warm September afternoon and which he intends to terminate very shortly by taking a lie down against a stook, in his imagination thinks what fine healthy work stooking is — and there are lots of worse ways of earning a living than stooking — even though the stooker has done two hours of it since dinner and will do another two hours after the weary partridge shooter has retired from the field in search of his supper.

Well these are just thoughts by the way but they all have a bearing on the subject and so we will continue to investigate until we get to the root of the matter and find the philosophy referred to has a firm foundation, or is just the bunk. In the first place suppose we ALL took the advice and ceased to strive for material things. This would result in living conditions being very much simplified no doubt because under our present economic set up a considerable amount of employment is brought about because those who can afford material things make a constant demand for them and this gives the workers a chance for a job. If this opportunity did not exist owing to the self-denial on the part of those who could afford them, then the workers certainly would not be able to have many material things because without work and wages their striving for material things would almost cease.

As a result of continued investigation we find the so called philosophy is based on a wrong understanding of a great truth. When Viscount Bennett advised the Canadian people not to strive too much for material things he probably had in mind the scripture which says, “Seek ye first the Kingdom of God and his righteousness: **and all these things shall be added unto you**”. Now we are told to seek for that Kingdom because then ALL will share in the good things and not just a few. You know we are promised real social security under the just laws of that Kingdom in these words, “Ye shall build houses and inhabit them; ye shall not build and another inhabit, — Every man shall sit under his own vine and fig tree and none shall hurt or make him afraid”. Thus if we truly seek that Kingdom by trying to establish a just economic system which will make the fruits of this power age available to all, we shall find that we thereby have all those other things added unto us. We rather think the advice is given to us so that we shall not merely strive

for ourselves alone. If we do, we may be as successful as Viscount Bennet was in obtaining personal riches but the world at large would still be poor. It is only by earnestly trying to apply the God given powers of this wonderful age for the benefit of ALL that we can truly be said to be seeking for the Kingdom of God and his righteousness. His righteousness means the carrying out of the Golden Rule in public as well as private affairs. We are told that "true religion" consists of looking after the widows and the fatherless and in the years following this war our rulers are thus going to be provided with a splendid opportunity for the practice of "true religion" as distinct from that bunk variety of "worshipping him with our lips, while our hearts are far from him".

Let us by all means pray and work for that coming Kingdom by continually reminding our present leaders of their responsibilities and privileges and at the same time fulfill our own, by demanding that our Country as a whole shall show its appreciation of the material blessings of this power age in which we live by making available to all our people, poor as well as rich, those material blessings with which we have been so bountifully and freely endowed, and then we shall find that those things for which we and Viscount Bennet spent our lives in striving, have indeed been added unto us.

Important Notice

Regarding the Annual Convention of the Alberta Farmers' Union.

The Convention will definitely be held.

No date has yet been set but it will probably be near the end of January.

Owing to difficulty in obtaining accommodation for delegates a ruling may be made that a representation of 1 in 20 only, will be allowed. (Not decided yet).

Each group is entitled to one delegate no matter how small.

All resolutions must be in by December 31st, 1942.

Each local should let us know definitely by December 31st, how many delegates they are prepared to send — on the following basis: If representation is 1—10; if representation is 1—20.

RADIO DONATION

The Dahlgren local No. 199 sent in a radio fund donation of \$3.70 on July 9th which has not yet been printed in the Bulletin.

Nov. 20th Mr. P. Werenka, Beauvallon, Secy., of Rannock Local, No. 63 \$2.00.

RADIO PROGRAMS

The attention of officers and members of all agricultural organizations in Alberta is directed to three radio programs, to be heard each Monday evening throughout the winter. These are as follows:

National Farm Radio Forum — CFAC, Calgary, CJOC, Lethbridge, CJCA, Edmonton—8.30 to 9:00 p. m. (Mondays);

Alberta Farm and Home Forum—CKUA, Edmonton, CFCN, Calgary—9:00 to 9:15 p. m. (Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays);

Co-operation & Co-operatives—CKUA, Edmonton, CFCN, Calgary—9:30 to 9:45 p.m. (Mondays).

Data with respect to National Farm Radio Forum has already gone forward to all concerned, from these headquarters.

The Alberta Farm and Home Forum is the result of a joint arrangement between the Agricultural Extension Service, Alberta Department of Agriculture, and the Extension Department, University of Alberta. This program is of considerable value to farmers since it contains a wealth of informative material respecting practical farm problems. During the winter months when farmers are not receiving their mail, newspapers, and farm periodicals regularly, this program is particularly apt.

"Co-operation and Co-operatives" is also a new feature, resulting from collaboration between the Alberta Federation of Agriculture, many of its member organizations, and the Department of Extension, University of Alberta. The series of broadcasts, under this title, is designed to make more widely known and stimulate interest in the co-operative movement in this province in all of its various phases.

It is urged that officers of farmers' organizations, to whom this bulletin is being addressed, make these three programs as widely known as is possible in their own districts.

ALBERTA FEDERATION OF AGRICULTURE,
E. W. Brunsden, Secretary.

A. F. U. Meetings

A series of meetings will be held in District No. 12 commencing November 30th, 1942.

The speakers will be Mr. Geo. Bevington and Mr. H. E. Nichols. Each will take a different line of meetings and will be accompanied by one or more of the district directors. We cannot give exact dates so watch for notices. After these meetings are concluded in District No. 12 a few meetings will be arranged for in District No. 10. These meetings will most probably be at Strathmore, Carbon, Three Hills and Drumheller.

Watch for notices for exact date and place.

A. F. U. Bulletin

Published monthly by Alberta Farmers' Union,
at the Central Office,
206 Agency Building, Edmonton, Alberta.

Subscription 50 cents per year.

Address:

A. F. U. BULLETIN
206 Agency Building, Edmonton, Alberta.

Editorial

FOR WHAT ARE WE WAITING?

Time is going along. We have been in the war now for a little over three years and this was supposed to be the war after which a New Order was going to be ushered in. How much is being done in order to have at least the framework of this new order to "usher in"? Mr. King said that unless the New Order was on its way before the war WAS OVER he was doubtful if it would EVEN BEGIN and for once we agree with Mr. King!

The first World War was supposed to be a War to end Wars. This war was supposed to bring in a new Order in which economic security would be available to all. The first war failed in its objective; how about the second one, is that going to fall too?

TAXATION AND GOLD STANDARD

For some time after Mr. King had uttered the above sentence there was quite a lot of talk about social reconstruction. Some kind of a council was set up and a noted economist Prof. James was put at the head of it. However, he holds out no hope that he believes in changing the present system so as to bring about the New Order. On the contrary he thinks heavy taxation must be maintained and on top of that he thinks the "Gold Standard" should be again "dug up" and used. So this "New Order" if built along the lines which the orthodox economists would make it, will result once more in the Rule of Gold instead of the Golden Rule.

Old standards are being thrown aside as a result of what we are learning in this war. Let us be sure the Gold Standard is also thrown aside for ever.

Taxation and more taxation is one of the remedies proposed by some as a remedy for the inequalities which exist. Experience should have taught us that those at whom "high taxation" is aimed, have a way of handing it back to the poor consumer in Prices and while the taxation of super incomes is a pleasant theory to talk about, it simply doesn't work in practice.

STRENGTHEN THE STRONGEST

If universal and high taxation was the remedy for the ills that assail us we should surely be on the upward path by now, because there never was a time when taxation was so severe. But any taxation system merely helps to relatively weaken the position of those who are not quite at the top; which consequently results in a still greater supremacy for those who ARE at the TOP.

We are sorry to see that Dr. Newland of Edmonton, one of our educational experts subscribes to the higher taxation theory. He says, "when the war is over there must be no loosening of the belts" and added "We must continue to pay high taxes to secure the kind of peace and education democracy desires".

Now I am going to put my opinion against that of Dr. Newland and say that that is just the kind of peace and education which democracy does NOT desire and by way of backing up the argument, I am going to quote further from Dr. Newland's own speech in which he admitted that there "must be something wrong with the way we teach mathematics, when a group of air cadets can learn in six weeks as much trigonometry as they didn't learn in twelve months at school".

Well the explanation is that NOW their interest is aroused and they have an OBJECTIVE in view. AMBITION becomes alive and they strive for RESULTS.

Also we have no doubt that THEY have OTHER results in view AFTERWARDS, and those RESULTS will not include higher taxation and a further tightening of the belt. They have seen and heard too much of that in times gone past and that is the reason they are now learning in six weeks what Dr. Newland's methods failed to teach in twelve months. We are glad that Dr. Newland recognizes that "Old teaching techniques must be modernized". We hope he will also modernize some of his own old "belt tightening" ideas.

THE BOND - AGE

The bond buying is being ballyhooed as the most patriotic thing a man can do, out-side of fighting. Let us examine it.

It means I am lending money on which I will get interest. It is a safe investment. For what? To make our way of life safe. How will that be accomplished? By somebody fighting for it and winning. Not by buying bonds. And who will pay interest? Why, the boys who did the fighting. They will first of all have to fight for democracy. They will also have to win to ensure its being carried on and — then they are going to be asked to pay interest to someone else so that they can have the privilege of enjoying it, — such as it will be, because there can be no real democracy in an interest paying Bond AGE.

Premier William Aberhart Speech on Post-War Problems of Agriculture

We are reproducing for the benefit of our readers a copy of a broadcast delivered by Premier Aberhart from Calgary on Thursday, November 19th.

Mr. Aberhart has certainly dealt with the "Problems of Agriculture" in a realistic manner and we want all members of the Alberta Farmers' Union to read this.

Good Evening, Ladies and Gentlemen:

Following last week's broadcast on the important question of rehabilitating our fighting men after the war, I received many interesting letters. These contained a number of very worthwhile suggestions, and I wish to thank all of you who wrote.

I appreciate the fact that for the most part, our proposals regarding the rehabilitation of our fighting men are meeting with your general approval. However there was one point which seems to have been misunderstood, and I wish to clear this up tonight. In suggesting that the minimum measure of economic security for our returned soldiers, sailors and airmen should be full pay and all allowances, including subsistence, I was, of course, referring to the basic scale applicable to a private in the army. In other words all should be treated alike. Surely any other arrangement would be most inequitable.

Before proceeding further, permit me to thank all who have contributed so generously to these broadcasts. Each of you should have received an acknowledgment from me. If you have not, please let me know, because it would mean that your letter has not reached me.

Tonight, radio friends, I propose to discuss another very vital aspect of Post-War Reconstruction — namely: "What About Agriculture?"

I gave this broadcast special announcement last week because I was anxious to have a large number of farmers and ranchers listening. I wanted to get their definite opinion of it. While my remarks concern the farmers and ranchers particularly, I want to direct them to our business and professional men as well. In my estimation there is no person — no matter what his occupation may be, whose economic security — yes, whose general welfare — is not closely linked to agriculture in some of its various aspects.

Too often we glibly say: "Yes indeed, agriculture is our basic industry and the very foundation of our national economy"; and then we stand by and allow the most disgraceful farm-

ing conditions to exist without the slightest protest whatever. That does not seem consistent.

Listen to me, men and women. When I contemplate the plight of our farmers — debt-ridden, forced to sell their products below production cost, denied the amenities which town and city dwellers take for granted, and obliged to work long hours under great handicaps, I wonder whether our business and professional men, our factory workers, our merchants and others, really recognize what the welfare or agriculture means to them?

I ask myself: "If they do, then why don't they take a stand? Surely they realize that so long as the farmer is getting such unfair, irresponsible and wretchedly disastrous treatment, it reacts to the detriment of every worker in every other industry — yes, of every citizen in our land?"

I do not need to point out that without agriculture there would be no other industry. That is self-evident. We all know that it was the first industry and that our whole elaborate civilization with its many other branches of industrial activity have all been developed from agriculture. It is the corner-stone of our national life; and I think we should all recognize that unless we have a virile and flourishing agriculture, we cannot have a prosperous Canada.

I therefore claim most emphatically that in laying the foundations of a new Post-War order, we must start with agriculture — because that is **the basic foundation** of our entire economic structure. I urge you, who have not given this aspect of the matter much attention, to think this over very carefully, for it concerns us all vitally.

Now, let us face the problems of agriculture as they are pressing themselves upon us to-day.

I take it that the first and most urgently pressing problem which is threatening to wreck agriculture is that of **the unsatisfactory prices of farm products**. For years our farmers have been forced to sell their products at prices which have been actually below production costs. Do we all realize what that means? It means that for years our farmers have been producing food for us all, and actually being out-of-pocket for doing so. In other words, they have been treated little better than serfs. In fact, ladies and gentlemen, in some respects they have been worse off than serfs were under the feudal system. At least the serfs did not have to go deeper and deeper into debt in order to keep on producing for their feudal

lords, and they were not harassed by threats of foreclosure.

You surely are aware of the devastating effects of the low prices which our farmers have been getting. Some of them, in order to acquire and operate their farms, have been obliged to borrow money.

Let us follow this though for a moment: A wheat farmer borrowed \$2,000 at 8% interest when wheat was \$1.40 a bushel. When the price of wheat slumped to 70c (actually it went much lower — but even at 70c) — that farmer had to sell twice as much wheat to meet his debt obligations. In other words the result was exactly the same as though his interest had been increased to 16% on the basis of his original debt, or as though the principal had been increased to \$4,000 at 8%; and in addition the resulting fall in land values robbed him of his equity in his farm. Surely this is quite a jolt to get in a few short years. We have said nothing about crop losses, due to drought or hail. He has to bear the brunt of all these also.

Now, wait a moment! His actual position is even worse than that. When wheat was \$1.40 he was able to meet his production costs and have a margin over to pay his debt obligations and provide for his living expenses. But at 70c he is lucky if he can meet his costs of production. He has no margin — and so though his debt has doubled he has no means of meeting the increased burden. He is therefore forced to go on getting deeper into debt.

But that is not all: There is another catch about the whole arrangement. The price he gets is subject to deduction for the freight charges of carrying his grain to Fort William. So that the farther west he lives the more heavily he is penalized. And not only does he get less for his wheat according to the distance he farms from Fort William, but he is forced to pay more for everything he buys. You see he has the freight both ways to face. Can you imagine a more unjust and fantastically stupid arrangement? Why should we allow this to continue? There then, briefly, is the nature of the price problem we have to tackle.

Now how shall we remedy it? What just and equitable basis must we establish to secure satisfactory farm prices?

The farmer, himself, has given us the answer: All he wants is a system of prices which will put him on the same footing as our manufacturing industrialists. The farmer would be satisfied with prices for his products which will cover his production costs and give him a return for his services comparable with other industries. I take that to be fair and reasonable, and I am ready to stand for it!

So the first essential step is to raise the prices of farm products, **at the point of delivery,**

so that they are on a parity with the average prices of manufactured goods.

Furthermore, our farmers must be given the assurance that they are producing what is actually wanted in the required quantities. Instead of the old haphazard way of carrying on, we must establish a definite and orderly long range policy for crop and livestock production. Our farmers and ranchers should have complete information as to probable future markets.

Then, too, it is essential that farmers should have access to adequate low cost credit in order to produce efficiently — I mean both in long term and short term credit. Though they have been moving in that direction in the United States, we have nothing remotely approaching satisfactory credit arrangements for agriculture in Canada as yet.

I'm not through yet: Closely bound up with the question of prices and proper credit facilities is the problem of farm debts. Ah! there's the rub!! I have every confidence in the great majority of the farmers in Canada. Given the means to meet their just debt obligations, our farmers would be scrupulously anxious to discharge their liabilities. I do not fear contradiction when I say, there is no more inherently honest group of people in Canada than the farmers. But much of the huge debt burden pressing upon them at present is neither fair or just — in fact it is crudely inhuman or devilish. As I have already shown you, much of these debts have been piled up as a result of causes beyond the farmers' control and of exorbitant interest. Common justice demands that they alone should not be expected to shoulder this accumulated burden due to conditions which have already penalized them so heavily.

So I submit that there will have to be a proper and equitable readjustment and settlement of all farm debts. We might as well make up our minds about this matter, ladies and gentlemen. It can be done, and it must be done — that is all there is to it — it is up to us to see that it is done.

There are just two more major matters with which I wish to deal tonight. The first of these is to stress the need of providing adequate marketing facilities for farm products, under conditions which will protect the farmer from the manipulation of prices by vested interests and from the evils of monopoly control over the marketing of his produce. I am confident that there will be general agreement on this, and therefore I do not need to elaborate on the urgent necessity for action along these lines.

Finally as the basis for a reconstructed agriculture, I submit that the whole system of land tenure must be revised. Hear me carefully! Land is the greatest asset of any community and it should be recognized as a sacred trust. We should not allow it to be abused simply to benefit the

few at the expense of the people as a whole, by permitting gambling in land values, unrestricted exploitation and monopoly control. These must be curbed. The owner or tenant of land must be assured security of tenure if he is to be expected to fulfil his trust. His investment must be protected; and the community too must be saved from land grabbing by large concerns who speculate for the purpose of keeping it out of production, or of working it with little better than slave labour, or perhaps of holding it to unload at greatly enhanced prices — and all that type of parasiting on legitimate agriculture.

The ghastly consequences of unrestricted land exploitation and wild cat gambling in land values are apparent on every hand in Canada today. We must put an end to it.

I am satisfied, ladies and gentlemen, that we can establish a sound scheme of land tenure which will preserve all the benefits and advantages of private ownership for the occupant, give him adequate security of tenure and at the same time eliminate all the obnoxious features of the present system.

I claim, ladies and gentlemen, that we must be ready to meet these problems now while there is yet time. We must be prepared to welcome our victorious fighting forces back to a Canada worthy of them. Just as they are smashing through to victory in the face of tremendous obstacles, so must we at home break down all resistance and indifference to keep faith with them by rising above the difficulties and problems which we face in doing this essential job. So let us get busy and co-operate to that end.

Good-night all — and thank you for your attention.

*

We sent the following letter to the Premier on behalf of the UNION.

Hon. Wm. Aberhart,
Dear Sir:

Allow me to express to you, as Secretary to an organization composed of over 15,000 farmers my appreciation of the realistic and comprehensive address given by yourself over the radio from Calgary on Thursday, November 19th, in which you dealt so thoroughly and so fairly with the Problems of Agriculture.

The handicaps under which the farmer labours were presented ably and fully and we are looking for remedies to be implemented which will free our basic industry from the stranglehold of undeserved debt, non-parity prices and the inequitable burden of uncontrollable crop failure.

I believe the farmers will give their unanimous support to any government, which will undertake to ensure that a beginning will at once be made to rectify conditions which have for too long crippled a large part of our population which is industrious, efficient, loyal and uncomplaining but which also is possessed of intelligence and determination and is convinced that unnecessary hardship and poverty is not any longer bearable and is also a detriment to all the industrious people in the Country.

Yours truly,

Secretary, Alberta Farmers' Union.

PROPOSED RESOLUTION FOR ANNUAL CONVENTION

WHEREAS, during the last three years the farmers of Alberta have increased their hog production by 100% and this is in spite of a steadily decreasing labor supply and a steadily increasing labor cost, AND

WHEREAS, we have been requested by the Government to still further increase our output of hogs, AND

WHEREAS, the price paid for hogs is still 25% below parity and more than 25% below hog price in the United States even though the efforts of both countries are supposed to be co-ordinated in a common war effort, AND

WHEREAS, restrictions and priorities are making it impossible for farmers to obtain materials to install labour saving devices which are necessary in order to cope with the present labor shortage and still produce as plentifully as before; while other industries are not subjected to such restrictions and are also allowed a cost of production plus,—price,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT we the Alberta Farmers' Union in convention assembled do hereby demand the following fair deal from the Dominion Government, that from now forward we be paid a Parity Price for our hogs based on the Government's own previous definition of the term in 1941 as it related to labor namely. That the highest price paid between 1926 and Dec. 1940 be called Parity and also that any increases which have occurred in the cost of living index since 1941 be added thereto. This would make present parity about Twenty-two dollars per 100 at Edmonton on rail.

Failing this we shall be compelled to base our future hog feeding activities to our present capacity (and will operate in the same way as all other industry).

POST WAR MARKETS

Reproduced from U.F.C. Information

Many people believe that when this war ends the Canadian Farmers will be able to dispose of their surplus products in the British and European countries and that their markets will continue to take all that we can produce for many years to come. It would, however, be well for our farmers not to become over enthusiastic over prospects of long term markets in Europe. If they do and propose to permanently increase production they may have to suffer cruel disappointment. Evidence that every effort will be made by the various countries to become self sufficient in the matter of food is already available. A report recently prepared by the London Chamber of Commerce on general principles of a post war economy indicates that it is well for our farmers to be very careful in their post war planning, for this report states that: "There is a general consensus throughout the country that agriculture must not again be allowed to fall into the state of decline prevalent before the war. It is evident that this country will no longer be entitled to that large tribute of food-stuffs, which, in the past, has come each year to this country by way of interest on loans. It will be necessary, therefore, to grow a higher percentage than in the past of our own food requirements.

This country is capable of being made the finest dairying country in the world and, with the exception of the Netherlands, its wheat-growing countries produce the largest yield per acre, although admittedly the acreage is small. According to the report on Grain Crops published by the Imperial Economic Committee in 1939, whereas the United Kingdom's average yield per acre was 18.1 cwt., that of Canada was 6.4 and of the Argentine 7.6. Hitherto the criterion of efficiency has been cost of production in competition with the new countries, which have been able to exploit the stored-up fertility of great periods of time. Year after year the same crops have been grown over vast areas in the new countries.

During war maximum production must override all other considerations, but it would be fatal to require its farmers in peacetime to exhaust the fertility of the soil in order to compete in price with food from abroad. Whether the destruction of the great wheat-growing areas is allowed to continue after the war or whether, as is to be expected, a change in farming practice is instituted, the time may come when the surplus of wheat available for export from these areas will be considerably reduced. Sir John Orr has estimated, that, in pre-war years, the diet of

about one-half the population of this country was that, in the case of 10 percent of the population, their diet was deficient in the main food constituents in every way. To eliminate in Great Britain under-nutrition as well as malnutrition, an increase in home-produced food would therefore be necessary, even if, in the future, we could rely upon the same volume of imported foodstuffs as in the past.

The Chamber therefore urges that competition for cheapness should not influence the Government in formulating a sound agricultural policy for this country (England). Prices which will enable the efficient farmer to pay reasonable wages and secure a fair return for himself must, by one means or another, be assured. Professor Sir George Stapledon, in "Make Fruitful the Land" published in 1941, estimates that more than half the agricultural land of England and Wales is in a more or less neglected condition, and much of it actually derelict.

MODERN FACILITIES

A vast amount of national wealth-producing labor will be needed to remedy past neglect and to bring not only all arable but the grass lands of England to their highest state of fertility; in addition, water needs to be brought to the farms, and farmhouses and cottages rebuilt or modernized. The Chamber submits that a systematic program of rehabilitation of the land should be prepared now and put in hand immediately upon cessation of hostilities. It is evident that a program on the comprehensive scale advocated could only be undertaken with Government assistance, and it is urged that where necessary, adequate supplies of interest-free capital should be made available for the purpose.

The Chamber further recommends that agricultural land should be scheduled for farming and should not be diverted to other uses".

The Canadian Farmers might study these proposals before embarking on an extension of their operations. They may face intensive agricultural development in Europe based upon interest-free capital and the British farmers will be geared for intensive production. Other European countries will be bound to intensify Food Production for home consumption. Perhaps we may have to trim our sails and face a situation of self sufficiency. We can do that and maintain a fair standard of life if we are on cash and farm ownership basis. But if we expand too fast and upon the basis of borrowed capital at high interest rates we will very soon face bankruptcy. Let us hold what we have.

The U. F. C. Annual Convention

(Reproduced from the 'U.F.C. Information')

By reason of unfavorable weather conditions and the consequent late harvest the executive of the United Farmers have decided to delay calling the Annual Convention this year until the second or third week in November. Definite dates will be announced later and locals will be officially advised in due course

This, the forty-second annual convention of the farmers educational and protective organization in Saskatchewan, must decide as to whether or not the U.F.C. shall continue to function. Following the 1941 annual convention which was held last October a committee which was appointed by that convention appeared before the Board of Directors of the various Provincial Co-operatives and the Saskatchewan association of Rural Municipalities with a request that these various organizations jointly advance a loan of \$5,000 to finance a re-organization campaign to strengthen the U.F.C., and further that they lend their organization facilities to assist in the campaign. The co-operatives were not willing to meet this request but proposed that each member organization of the co-operative conference appoint representatives to a committee which would give consideration to the position of the U.F.C. and ascertain if some such organizations was necessary to the farmers.

This committee met on January 7th, 1942. It was decided that no assistance financially or otherwise be given to the U.F.C. for re-organization purposes. The Saskatchewan Wheat Pool proposed that the co-operative conference undertake to do the work which the U.F.C. is now doing. The other members of the conference would not agree to the pool's proposals but suggested that a new organization be sponsored jointly by the member organization of the co-operative conference, that the new organization be financed by a tax levy of 25 cents per quarter section of land to be collected by the municipalities and that an objective of 100,000 members be aimed at. This organization to be non-political and non-commercial and its aim and objective would be similar to that of the U.F.C. namely to promote the interests of the farmers in any honorable and legitimate way. The Wheat pool representatives stated that there was no demand from the rank and file farmers for such an organization and they, the farmers, were looking to the co-operatives for a solution of their problems. Several meetings were held by this committee during the summer months but the wheat pool board has not changed their attitude towards the proposed new association and the other members of the conference hesitate to start an organization campaign without being able to

go to the country as a united body with the wheat pool in full co-operation in the effort. The Saskatchewan association of Rural Municipalities which is also a member of the co-operative conference and is represented on the Provisional committee of the proposed organization has conducted a survey of the municipal councils which shows that two-thirds of the councillors are in favor of the new organization and are willing to lend some support in the campaign. But the wheat pool is not impressed with the results of the survey and claim that it does not indicate any desire on the part of the farmers for a membership union.

We trust that the provisional committee will meet before the U.F.C. convention is held and make their decision as to whether or not they will proceed to organize. If they do not organize, then the U.F.C. convention must decide if it is possible to carry on upon a voluntary membership basis or if the organization must wind up its affairs and leave it to the co-operatives to serve the farmers needs. The record of services by the farmers membership organization during the past 40 years speaks for itself. If the co-operatives take an aggressive stand in such matters as debt adjustment, demand lower interest rates, a reduction in freight and transportation rates and other matters that must receive attention if the farmers ever expect to recover from their present semi-bankrupt position. We repeat that if the co-operatives take an aggressive stand then they will pay for it, at the expense of their farmer members of course, by withdrawal of deliveries of grain to pool elevators by credit institutions, by organized opposition to their development, and by interference with their activities in all lines. The well organized financial and commercial institutions, transportation companies and Life Insurance companies will not remain idle in the face of attack and evidence of their attitude towards the co-operatives which has already appeared in the Financial Post, and other publications. If and when co-operative organizations which must operate within the confines of this present economy attack the special privileged classes they will defend themselves and means are not lacking wherewith to crush opponents. If on the other hand the farmers will insist that the co-operatives attend to the business for which they were primarily organized namely the co-operative selling of farm products and the co-operative purchasing of consumers goods whereby we effect savings and build a foundation of a new economic order and then attack special privilege through the medium of farmers' Union which is adequately

financed and has a 100% membership and is free from political and commercial entanglements then we will get results as do all other organized occupational groups. The coming U.F.C. Convention has a job to do as it always has had, but this time there is a matter of a showdown. We do or die.

What Mr. Gardiner Says to the Farmers

Hon. J. G. Gardiner, federal Minister of Agriculture, stepped up to the microphone on the Farm Forum program in November and told something about the agricultural situation in Canada.

The Minister of Agriculture said that Canadian farmers had achieved their astounding record of production of food through farmers, their wives and children working very long hours and paying no attention to the regulations under which labor works. Farmers' wives often work from five in the morning till ten at night, he said. School children spend hours in the morning and evening doing chores; while overtime and holidays are matters completely disregarded by the farmer.

Mr. Gardiner had this to say of wheat: the government has well over \$400 million invested in the commodity and it is costing about \$50 million annually to store the surplus. The present government policy with regard to wheat is a temporary one calculated to carry the wheat farmers along until the war ends.

The Minister of Agriculture advised farmers to sow the same acreage of coarse grains next year as was done this year, and to feed every beef animal it has eaten the last pound of grain which will profitably put beef on it, and to increase the number available for future feeding. Canada needs every pound of beef and pork her farmers can produce for domestic requirements and to feed Britain and others of the United Nations. Canada needs more dairy products. An additional 20 million pounds of butter a year are required.

Dealing with the shortage of labor on farms, the minister said that it had been recognized that if Canadian institutions were to be preserved, able-bodied men had to go to the armed forces and to the factories. So farmers lost one-fifth of the available farm labor.

"It is difficult to understand how an industry which gave 20 per cent of its able-bodied men, in the face of unprecedented demands upon its productive capacity, could have accomplished the task one hundred per cent", said the minister. "It is only those who understand farm life who realize how this was done. This production would never have been possible had not every law, which

makes living conditions what they are in industry, been broken voluntarily upon the farm. I think I am speaking for the great majority of the well-informed people of Canada when I say to the farmer, his wife, his children, and his hired man—thank you for a national job unselfishly done."

What Mr. Gardiner Does for the Farmers

Hon. J. G. Gardiner, dominion Minister of Agriculture, who warned farmers that he dare not promise too much in regard to farm help. Farm labor will be stabilized as much as possible, he told the Ontario Federation of Agriculture but "manpower for the fighting forces and for production of munitions now takes precedence over manpower for farms."

What the United States DOES for the Farmers.

Guarantees labor for United States farmers. Declaring an ample supply of food is vital to winning of the war, Chairman Paul V. McNutt said Friday night that the United States War Manpower Commission will take any action necessary to guarantee enough farm labor to reach 1943 production goals.

Co-operation and the Post War World

Reproduced from U.F.C. Information

We have from time to time endeavored in this publication to point out that while co-operative business enterprise is necessary as a foundation for a new democratic order it is incorrect to take the position that all that is necessary to do if we want a new order based upon the principle of equal rights to all and special privileges to none, is to become a member of the co-operative movement and do our buying and selling co-operatively. We have been criticized for advocating much more detailed Post War planning by the people in general and the co-operatives in particular but we still maintain our stand in this matter because we are convinced that if all that we do for our future is to be good co-operators and leave the planning to the Financiers, Industrialists, and Governments controlled by them we shall face the conditions which are so well outlined by Professor Hans Elias of the Middlesex University, following this article. We are, however, greatly encouraged to find that recently some of our outstanding advocates of co-operation have come out boldly in favor of some more drastic measures. They recognize that co-operation in itself will not provide a solution either for our present problems nor will it be able to meet Post War conditions effectively.

Mr. A. P. (Pat) Waldron in an Editorial in the Western Producer of September 3rd, said,

"There is nothing unpractical about the co-operative movement, but the fact remains that one hundred years of experience with it has not produced the conviction that by and of itself it will do what may theoretically be postulated of it. A national economic order must be linked with political order and must have behind it the power of the political order, which, to put it plainly, means that a national economic order to supersede the present economic order, must like the political order, rest upon the will and the power of the majority. Action toward this end is imperatively necessary now if the people of the democracies are to be lifted out of the disillusionment of the last twenty years. They must be made to realize that democracy does contain the promise of a life worth fighting for. There is still an important and valuable place for co-operative economic action, only the term must not always be limited to voluntary co-operation, but include organizations formed for specific purpose and including in the membership all citizens within a given area whose economic activities come within that purpose. The co-operative idea itself must grow; it must throw off its nineteenth century swaddling clothes and advance with the changes which the revolutionary events of the twentieth century have created and are continuing to create. The term of a real national economy is contained in the principles and the practices of the co-operative movement; it is the duty of co-operators to see that it develops into that national economy".

Well said Mr. Waldron. And now we have a statement by that ardent co-operator Mr. Norman Priestly, former Vice-President of the United Farmers of Alberta and General manager of the U. F. A. Central Co-Operative Association. In a recent very well written article entitled, "Co-operatives and Post War Reconstruction" which appeared in the "Western Farm Leader" of September 18th, Mr. Priestly says, "There are some facts which we of the Co-operative movement must face. Large numbers of people have been converted by the demonstration of national economic efficiency on the part of the totalitarian states, and more tardily the United Nation in opposing and defeating them, to belief in some form of socialism. They will not tolerate for long a return to the conditions of 1930 to 1935. They will be insistent that the controls which have been set up by Government to carry on the war must continue to be applied for the period of rehabilitation and beyond.

There is also the fact that the war's demands will have fallen heavily upon small private enterprises. Already through the shift of manpower, establishing of priorities and rationing, etc., many of these have been put out of business. More and more of our machinery of production and

distribution will have been taken over by the large industrialists and big commercial concerns. The power of their accumulated capital and the efficiency of their operations will not easily be met by newly formed co-operative enterprises.

Let us not be self-deluded in our enthusiasm for the co-operative way of living. Neither press, platform, pulpit nor radio, nor indeed any or all of them combined, will be able to create sufficient unity of thought, much less the will to action on any one plan, to make possible the transference of ownership and control of the economic life for the United Nations to a voluntary co-operative basis quickly enough to meet the needs of the immediate post-war period. On the other hand, to revert to Laissez-faire, the so-called economic freedom being advocated unblushingly by Herbert Hoover and others, would mean chaos. There is therefore no doubt that following the war we face a period of continued government intervention in business whatever the outcome of the political struggle on the paramount question of ownership may be".

It should be self evident to all who have given even the slightest considerations of what might follow the cessation of the present armed conflict that unless the common people are prepared to organize and work out their own plans for reconstruction the principles outlined in the Atlantic Charter will be completely ignored. The present economy will be maintained and the distributed conditions will be met by the same ruthless methods that were used during the depression. The producing classes will be brought to a

GET IT FROM A.F.U. BULLETIN

The Only Farmers Union Paper in Alberta
This Form is for Your Convenience —
Mail It Today

A. F. U. BULLETIN,
206 Agency Building, Edmonton, Alberta.

Dear Sir,

Enclosed please find 50 cents for one year (25c for six months) Subscription to the A. F. U. Bulletin.

NAME (Print)

ADDRESS

semi-starvation level and industries, etc., which have been destroyed during the war will be rebuilt with hand labor at starvation wages. By such methods capitalism can continue to function until the next war. We challenge our readers to approach the present leaders in Government, Finance and Industry and broach the subject of post war conditions. We wager that they will be told that, "After the war we want to get back to normal conditions", or, "we want some form of co-operation". Think this over.

Dr. Hans Elias of Middlesex University predicted that the Post War World, "would be so poor that women would have to return to their great-great grandma's spinning wheel and men would have to build their own cottage.

"There will be no cars, radios, washing machines or refrigerators in the world that will exist after the War", contended the Waltham Mass., educator. "The masses of the people will be impoverished by the burden which the war imposes upon everyone.

"There will be practically no export industry because the countries abroad are already completely exhausted. There will be practically no import trade, because whatever the destroyed countries produce they will need for themselves, and we shall no longer be wealthy enough to buy more than we need."

The professor expounded those views to point out his suggestion that farming should be a compulsory subject in every school. He maintained that farmers would be "independent of the outside world", and added:

"Whoever can get a hold of a little piece of land will if provided with farming skill, be able to keep the wolf from the door."

Doctor Elias figured carpentry, forestry and tanning should be taught to every boy and spinning, weaving and sewing to every girl."

NEW CREDIT NECESSARY

Remember, every Public facility or utility set up is an Asset to the Province or Nation and if done under proper supervision will always be worth the dollars it cost to build. As the people do the work and nature supplies the materials, so should the Bank of Canada supply the money. That is what it was set up for. "To issue Public Credit in terms of Public Need". There is no need to pay interest on the money, just the cost

of issuing the notes and a small depreciation charge to take care of actual depreciation.

As the people progress and get into a position to justifiably demand more public services, these things should be provided and financed by an issue of New CREDIT. Just as the actual public services are created by labor so can the financial tokens be provided by a little book-keeping. In this way we can gradually build up Assets all over the Province and they will be a CREDIT instead of a DEBT.

CREDIT WHERE CREDIT IS DUE

We have often criticized government for not consulting the representative farm bodies more than they do when contemplating future legislation but a notable exception has been made by our Alberta Government. The Provincial Minister of Agriculture, Hon. D. B. McMillan has set up an Agricultural Consulting Committee which consists of the representations of farmer bodies and the Government. This committee under the chairmanship of Mr. O. S. Longman hopes to receive suggestions from practical farmers, through their representatives, on the many problems which beset us. It is not set up to tell us how, but rather for them to listen how, and then transform practical suggestions into government action. This is more like democracy in Action.

EDITOR VS LAWYER

Here is something from a "Country Editor's scrapbook published in 1932 which may well find its way into many other country Editor's scrapbook.

The Lawyer

I slept in an Editor's bed last night,
When no other chanced to be nigh,
And I thought, as I tumbled into the editor's
bed,
How easily editors lie.

The Editor

If the lawyer slept in the Editor's bed,
When no other chanced to be nigh,
And though he has written and naively said,
How easily editors lie.
He must then admit, as he lay on that bed,
And slept to his heart's desire,
Though the editor's bed offered easy repose,
That the lawyer himself was the liar.